> which device configuration is completely automatic, and may automatically change when a device is added or deleted. One ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention can interpret automatically configuring peripheral device as automatically configuring a host computer, in either case automatic configuration based on detecting certain parameters or thresholds.

As mentioned in Applicants' prior papers, Firooz is directed to a PC in which peripheral devices may be automatically configured as primary or secondary upon start up, and Staheli is directed to a network environment in which a secondary network server can be manually configured to serve as a replacement for a failed primer server. Thus, any combination of these two references would (at most) yield a system in which the primary and secondary network servers disclosed by Staheli would include peripheral devices which could be automatically configured as primary and secondary upon start up, as disclosed by Firooz, but wherein failure of the primary network server would result in a **manual** configuration of the second server as a **replacement**.

Even if the Advisory Action's characterization of the configuring of a peripheral in Firooz as constituting automatic configuration of a host computer were correct, such a characterization is simply not relevant to the nature of the system that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to based on the combined teachings of Firooz and Staheli. These references teach what they teach and no characterization of the references can expand those teachings. Firooz simply teaches automatically configuring peripherals in a PC, nothing more.

Firooz clearly does not teach the method recited, for example, in claim 1, which is directed to detecting a decrease in performance of a first host computer that provides computational resources to perform a task, and automatically configuring a second host computer to provide additional computational resources for the first. Thus, even if Firooz could be characterized as teaching the automatic configuration of a host computer, it clearly does not teach the specific type of configuration recited in Applicants' claims.

In addition, in the previous amendment, Applicants specifically amended the claims to clarify that the configuration of the second host computer is to provide additional resources for the first, so that the first and second host computers simultaneously provide computational resources to perform a task. This is simply not taught or suggested in either of the prior art

references of record. The Advisory Action was silent in this respect. Applicants respectfully assert that this limitation clearly distinguishes over the prior art of record.